



planning and development consultants

MEMORANDUM

To: South Euclid Planning Commission
From: David Hartt
Date: June 10, 2004 (Revised September 22, 2005)
Subject: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE – Revised to Reflect Planning Commission's Review and Comments

Attached is the background material for the Planning Commission's review. This document has been revised and updated to reflect the comments made by the Planning Commission at its May 13, 2004 meeting and subsequent meetings thereafter.

Part I. Review of Updated Data. Part I includes updated data currently compiled by the consultants to highlight changes in the City during the time the data was first assembled for the 2000 Plan. "Numbered" tables are those tables in the 2000 Plan, that have been revised and updated. "Lettered" tables are new tables added either by the consultants or as requested by the Planning Commission. Both the revised and new tables were added by the Consultants, at their own volition, or at the request of the Planning Commission. The purpose of these tables was to determine if the new data would have a bearing on the proposed changes (update) to the Comprehensive Plan. In some cases the additional data has influenced the recommendations; in other instances the data has not.

- ▶ **Table 1-A** compares population trends of South Euclid with surrounding communities. This was added as general background information and for comparisons with other data in the 2000 Plan. When the 2000 Plan was completed the 2000 Census Data was not available to make these comparisons.
- ▶ **Tables 2-A & 2-B** add population age groups (numbers and percentages) in South Euclid compared to surrounding communities. This was added, at the request of the Planning commission, to better understand the trends for these important population cohorts
- ▶ **Tables 2-C & 2-D** compare total dwelling units in South Euclid with surrounding communities and likewise, number of people per household. Consistent with the

**MEMORANDUM
SOUTH EUCLID PLANNING COMMISSION**

other updated tables, this information incorporates data from the 2000 Census and compares South Euclid with its surrounding communities.

- ▶ **Table 2-E** compares the percentage of households in South Euclid that are occupied with a person under 18 and over 65 with surrounding communities. (See under Table 2-C, above.)
- ▶ **Tables 2-F & 2-G** compare median household income and median housing value in South Euclid with surrounding communities. (See under Table 2-C, above.)
- ▶ **Table 2-H** compares home values in South Euclid between 1990 and 2000 at various lower, median and higher value ranges. (See under Table 2-C, above.)
- ▶ **Table 3-A** compares commercial tax rates in South Euclid with surrounding communities. This complements Table 3 which includes the effective tax rates for residential property.
- ▶ **Table 4-A** compares percentage of real estate tax base in South Euclid that is derived from commercial property, with surrounding communities.
- ▶ **Appendix Tables 1-3** were revised to incorporate 2003 valuations.

Part II. Summary Matrix. Part II is a matrix that summarizes the policies and implementation strategies identified in the 2000 South Euclid Comprehensive Plan. Notes have been added to this matrix to specifically indicate:

- ▶ Policies/implementation strategies that remain valid – or remain valid with slight modifications;
- ▶ Policies/implementation strategies that are no longer applicable;
- ▶ Implementation measures that have been substantially and successfully accomplished;
- ▶ Implementation measures that have not yet been accomplished but which should continue to be pursued.

The Planning Commission evaluated the appropriateness of the 2000 Comprehensive Plan and the revisions that should be incorporated based on its consideration of the following trends and observations:

1. In recent years, there has been a noticeable increase in the number of young professionals just out of school, usually single, that are buying and renovating the smaller bungalows as their first home rather than initially renting an apartment. Presumably this is, in part, attributed to the modest value of the initial investment coupled with low mortgage interest rates. The buyers also avoid the monthly fees associated with cluster/condominium projects.
2. The number of infill cluster/townhouse projects that have been built or are being proposed have increased dramatically since the 2000 Plan was adopted. Currently

**MEMORANDUM
SOUTH EUCLID PLANNING COMMISSION**

there are several new residential projects in the predevelopment process; many of these are in the north end of the City.

3. The City should capitalize on the level of development interest and consider the Monticello/Green area for a broader range of uses than is currently permitted. There is a proposed policy related to this observation in the matrix.

As a result of this review, this memorandum and the attached Part I (Updated Background Data) and Part II (Summary Matrix) are an addendum to the 2000 Comprehensive Plan. The updated Plan, therefore, includes both of these documents.

Part I. Updated Background Data

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

Table 1-A - New				
Population of Area Communities - 1990 & 2000				
Community	1990	2000	Change 1990 - 2000	
			#	%
Beachwood	10,677	12,186	1,509	14%
Cleveland	505,616	478,403	-27,213	-5%
Cleveland Heights	54,052	49,958	-4,094	-8%
Euclid	54,875	52,717	-2,158	-4%
Lyndhurst	15,982	15,279	-703	-4%
Richmond Heights	9,611	10,944	1,333	14%
South Euclid	23,866	23,537	-329	-1%
University Heights	14,790	14,146	-644	-4%
Cuyahoga County	1,412,140	1,393,978	-18,162	-1%

Table 2 - Revised to Include Data for 2000				
Percentage of Population 65 years and Older				
	Population 1990	Population 2000	% Over 65 1990*	% Over 65 2000
South Euclid	23,866	23,537	18.8%	15.3%
Cuyahoga County	1,412,140	1,393,978	15.7%	15.6%
Geauga County	81,129	90,895	10.6%	12%
Lake County	215,499	227,511	12.0%	14.1%
Lorain County	271,126	284,664	11.6%	12.5%
Medina County	122,354	151,095	9.7%	10.5%
Portage County	142,585	152,061	9.4%	11%
Summit County	514,990	542,899	13.8%	14.1%
Statewide	10,847,115	11,353,140	13.0%	13.3%

DATA SOURCE: US Census Bureau

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

Table 2-A - New				
Percentage of Population in 35-54 age group				
	Population	Population	%	%
	1990	2000	1990	2000
South Euclid	23,866	23,537	25.30%	31.30%
Beachwood	10,677	12,186	24.40%	26.30%
Cleveland	505,616	478,403	21.40%	26.90%
Cleveland Heights	54,052	49,958	27.40%	30.00%
Euclid	54,875	52,717	22.40%	28.90%
Lyndhurst	15,982	15,279	23.80%	27.80%
Richmond Heights	9,611	10,944	26.30%	31.30%
University Heights	14,790	14,146	22.70%	25.10%
Cuyahoga County	1,412,140	1,393,978	24.40%	29.20%

Table 2-B - New				
Percentage of Population 65 years and Older				
	Population	Population	% Over 65	% Over 65
	1990	2000	1990	2000
South Euclid	23,866	23,537	18.80%	15.30%
Beachwood	10,677	12,186	31.70%	35.40%
Cleveland	505,616	478,403	14.00%	12.50%
Cleveland Heights	54,052	49,958	12.80%	11.70%
Euclid	54,875	52,717	22.20%	19.20%
Lyndhurst	15,982	15,279	24.10%	26.30%
Richmond Heights	9,611	10,944	17.40%	17.70%
University Heights	14,790	14,146	15.50%	13.40%
Cuyahoga County	1,412,140	1,393,978	15.70%	15.60%

DATA SOURCE: US Census Bureau

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

Table 2-C – New				
Housing Units 1990 & 2000				
	1990	2000	Change 1990 – 2000	
			#	%
Beachwood	4,732	5,447	715	15%
Cleveland	224,311	215,856	-8,455	-4%
Cleveland Heights	21,862	21,798	-64	-0%
Euclid	26,586	26,123	-463	-2%
Lyndhurst	6,729	6,855	126	2%
Richmond Heights	4,503	5,060	557	12%
South Euclid	9,565	9,854	289	3%
University Heights	5,286	5,350	64	1%
Cuyahoga County	604,538	616,903	12,365	2%

Table 2-D – New			
Persons Per Household			
	1990	2000	1990-2000 % Change
Beachwood	2.31	2.2	-4.76%
Euclid	2.17	2.14	-1.38%
Lyndhurst	2.43	2.27	-6.58%
Cleveland	2.48	2.44	-1.61%
Richmond Heights	2.22	2.22	0.00%
University Heights	2.5	2.37	-5.20%
Cleveland Heights	2.52	2.38	-5.56%
South Euclid	2.52	2.45	-2.78%
Cuyahoga County	2.46	2.39	-2.85%

DATA SOURCE: US Census Bureau

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

Table 2-E – New						
Younger and Older Households 1990 & 2000						
	Total Households		Households with Children Under the Age of 18		Households with Individuals 65+	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Beachwood	4,378	5,074	23%	25%	47%	48%
Euclid	24,894	24,353	24%	27%	35%	31%
Lyndhurst	6,580	6,642	26%	25%	41%	41%
Cleveland	199,787	190,638	34%	35%	27%	24%
Richmond Heights	4,320	4,864	23%	26%	28%	27%
University Heights	5,151	5,163	32%	31%	32%	27%
Cleveland Heights	21,012	20,913	33%	30%	23%	21%
South Euclid	9,388	9,542	32%	34%	34%	28%
Cuyahoga County	563,243	571,457	32%	32%	29%	27%

Table 2-F New			
Median Household Income			
	1989	1999	% Increase
Beachwood	\$54,340	\$65,406	20%
Cleveland	\$17,822	\$25,928	45%
Cleveland Heights	\$36,043	\$46,731	30%
Euclid	\$26,904	\$35,151	31%
Lyndhurst	\$40,491	\$52,272	29%
Richmond Heights	\$34,402	\$43,625	27%
South Euclid	\$36,119	\$48,346	34%
University Heights	\$43,376	\$61,635	42%
Cuyahoga County	\$28,595	\$39,168	37%

DATA SOURCE: US Census Bureau

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

Table 2-G – New			
Median Value of Specified Owner Occupied Units			
	1990	2000	% Annual Average Increase
Beachwood	\$168,000	\$244,700	5%
Cleveland	\$40,900	\$72,100	8%
Cleveland Heights	\$71,500	\$109,500	5%
Euclid	\$65,000	\$90,800	4%
Lyndhurst	\$88,800	\$134,600	5%
Richmond Heights	\$97,600	\$140,800	4%
South Euclid	\$71,200	\$106,600	5%
University Heights	\$90,400	\$136,400	5%
Cuyahoga County	\$72,100	\$113,800	6%

Table 2-H – New			
Values of Specified Owner Occupied Units-South Euclid			
	1990	2000	% Annual Average Increase
Upper Quartile	\$88,600	\$128,000	4%
Lower Quartile	\$63,000	\$91,000	4%
Median value	\$71,200	\$106,600	5%

DATA SOURCE: US Census Bureau

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

Table 3 -- Revised to Add the Tax Rates for 2003			
Effective Residential Property Tax Rates			
	1997	2003	% Change
Beachwood	43.71	52.17	19.4%
Cleveland	60.62	64.42	6.3%
Cleveland Heights	82.78	83.58	1.0%
Euclid	54.19	58.59	8.1%
Lyndhurst	59.22	70.04	18.3%
Richmond Heights	61.02	64.16	5.1%
South Euclid	61.55	71.88	16.8%
University Heights	81.18	82.78	2.0%

Table 3-A -- New			
Effective Commercial Property Tax Rates			
	1997	2003	% Change
Beachwood	55.79	62.18	11.5%
Cleveland	76.07	84.03	10.5%
Cleveland Heights	100.02	103	3.0%
Euclid	69.94	75.62	8.1%
Lyndhurst	69.7	76.08	9.2%
Richmond Heights	68.75	73.48	6.9%
South Euclid	71.99	77.99	8.3%
University Heights	98.42	102.2	3.8%

DATA SOURCE: US Census Bureau

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

Table 4 - Revised to Add Figures for 2003 and to Include More Communities in the Comparison		
Percentage of Real Estate Tax Base Derived from Residential Property (1997 - 2003 Tax Year)		
	1997	2003
Beachwood	45%	44%
Cleveland	38%	45%
Cleveland Heights	79%	78%
Euclid	58%	63%
Lyndhurst	79%	78%
Richmond Heights	64%	73%
South Euclid	81%	84%
University Heights	84%	86%
County, exclusive of Cleveland	65%	68%

Table 4-A - New		
Percentage of Real Estate Tax Base Derived from Commercial Property (1997 - 2003 Tax Year)		
	1997	2003
Beachwood	46%	46%
Cleveland	46%	37%
Cleveland Heights	18%	16%
Euclid	28%	23%
Lyndhurst	19%	18%
Richmond Heights	29%	20%
South Euclid	15%	11%
University Heights	14%	11%
County, exclusive of Cleveland	26%	23%

DATA SOURCE: Cuyahoga County Auditor's Office

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

**APPENDIX TABLE 1 - Revised to Reflect 2003 Rates
COMPARISON OF 2003 RATES OF TAXATION**

City of South Euclid and Surrounding Jurisdictions (Ranked by effective residential tax rate)

Community	Voted Tax Rate	Effective Residential Tax Rate	Effective Commercial And Industrial Tax Rate
Beachwood	100.9	52.17	62.18
Cleveland	102.3	64.42	84.03
Cleveland Heights	159	83.58	103
Euclid	106.4	58.59	75.62
Lyndhurst	120.7	70.04	76.08
Richmond Heights	112.1	64.16	73.48
South Euclid	124.2	71.88	77.99
University Heights	158.2	82.78	102.2

DATA SOURCE: Cuyahoga County Auditor

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

APPENDIX TABLE 2 - Revised to Reflect 2003 Valuations

COMPARISON OF ASSESSED TAX VALUATIONS: TAX YEAR 2003

Community	Total Valuation (In \$)	Real Property				Tangible Personal Property	
		Agricultural/ Residential		Commercial/ Industrial/ P U		\$	%
		\$	%	\$	%		
Beachwood	742,232,477	329,036,850	44%	341,285,140	46%	71,910,487	10%
Euclid	865,435,613	549,167,830	63%	202,727,320	23%	113,540,463	13%
Lyndhurst	428,840,955	335,908,070	78%	78,198,780	18%	14,734,105	3%
Cleveland	5,831,874,596	2,626,005,920	45%	2,133,547,070	37%	1,072,321,606	18%
Richmond Heights	238,226,560	173,253,690	73%	46,887,670	20%	18,085,200	8%
South Euclid	397,064,308	334,405,320	84%	42,934,220	11%	19,724,768	5%
University Heights	257,958,377	222,853,010	86%	27,228,410	11%	7,876,957	3%
Cleveland Heights	837,602,047	656,908,220	78%	133,420,680	16%	47,273,147	6%
County Summary							
Cuyahoga County	30,305,031,529	19,186,925,480	63%	7,652,431,860	25%	3,465,674,189	11%
Excluding Cleveland	24,473,156,933	16,560,919,560	68%	5,518,884,790	23%	2,393,352,583	10%

Note: Percentages may not total 100% exactly due to rounding

DATA SOURCE: Cuyahoga County Auditor

**PART I
UPDATED BACKGROUND DATA**

APPENDIX TABLE 3 - Revised to Include 2003 Values					
<i>COMPARISON OF Total Property (Real and PP) VALUATION per DWELLING UNIT*</i>					
	1997		2003		% Increase
	Total Value	Value Per Unit	Total Value	Value per unit	
Beachwood	\$580,801,639	\$122,739	\$742,232,477	\$136,264	11.02%
Cleveland	\$5,375,222,416	\$23,963	\$5,831,874,596	\$27,017	12.75%
Cleveland Heights	\$670,565,771	\$30,673	\$837,602,047	\$38,426	25.28%
Euclid	\$793,607,480	\$29,851	\$865,435,613	\$33,129	10.98%
Lyndhurst	\$349,725,426	\$51,973	\$428,840,955	\$62,559	20.37%
Richmond Heights	\$219,650,598	\$48,779	\$238,226,560	\$47,080	-3.48%
South Euclid	\$356,749,991	\$37,297	\$397,064,308	\$40,295	8.04%
University Heights	\$202,556,321	\$38,319	\$257,958,377	\$48,217	25.83%
County Summary					
Cuyahoga County	\$24,953,150,094	\$41,276	\$30,305,031,529	\$49,124	19.01%

*Derived by dividing the total real and tangible property valuation for the community by the housing units for the year from US Census Bureau

DATA SOURCE: Cuyahoga County Auditor

Part II. Summary Matrix

DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion

Part V - Overall Community Objectives (p. 19)*	The Objective:		Revised Goals/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
<p>Objective A. Remain Competitive in the Regional Market (p. 19)</p> <p>1. Provide More Single-Family Housing Choices to meet needs/desires of region's home buyers; recognizing that: (p. 19)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing decisions balance lifestyle preferences and ability to pay ▪ Housing chosen solely on its affordability is only a temporary choice until household can afford to move to its lifestyle preference. 	Yes	No	Need to incorporate the policies and findings from the First Suburbs Consortium Report on housing choices
<p>1b. Provide for a Variety Of Housing Opportunities (For All Phases Of "Life Cycle") (p. 19)</p>	Yes	No	Same as above
<p>2. Encourage Non-Residential Development to Meet Current Needs; recognizing that: (p. 19)*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a plethora of Retail Choices outside the City to meet the needs of residents. ▪ City's industrial sites do not meet current industrial location criteria ▪ Major office developments are concentrated in few locations – all outside the city with easy access to highway system 	Yes	No	
<p>New</p> <p>The City should seize the opportunity to build on current market interest, and support in as many ways possible those interested in purchasing and renovating the single-family bungalows. Such support could include: marketing, financial assistance, design assistance to illustrate how these homes can be efficiently modified.</p>	New	New	

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

**PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX**

**DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion**

Part V - Overall Community Objectives (p. 19)*	The Objective:		Revised Goals/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
3. Assure that Development Provides Adequate Tax Revenue to Maintain Public Services	Yes	No	
Objective B. Enable and Encourage Non-Residential Uses to Expand or Redevelop (p. 20)			
Respond to Current Market Needs (p. 20)	Yes	No	
Increase Tax Revenue (p. 20)	Yes	No	
Overcome Functional and Locational Obsolescence (p. 20)	Yes	No	
Provide for "Logical Extensions" of Existing Non-Residential Areas (p. 20)	Yes	No	
Maintain and Improve Buffer between Residential and Non-Residential (p. 20)	Yes	No	
Objective C. Promote Housing as the City's Primary "Industry (p. 20)			
Promote the comprehensive Use of New Tools that Assure High Level of Housing Maintenance (p. 20) A systematic inspection program should be tied to a systematic street improvement program	Yes	Currently the City has a systematic exterior inspection program. Additional Implementation	An ordinance that would require exterior only point of sale inspections of property was prepared in 2003. The Planning Commission recommended passage. The Ordinance was referred to a Council committee but, because of budget constraints, no action was taken. It is

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

**PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX**

**DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion**

Part V - Overall Community Objectives (p. 19)*	The Objective:		Revised Goals/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
		measures will continue to be considered	anticipated that the Ordinance could be reintroduced in 2006.
Encourage Infill Housing (p. 20)* – that may include development of vacant land or the redevelopment of selected areas.	Yes	Continuing	This plan addendum recognizes that existing permitted densities may not be sufficient to achieve economical infill or redevelopment. Therefore, the zoning regulations must provide a vehicle to permit an increase in the densities on a case-by-case basis. (See also III A 6 b)
Promote Revitalization of Current Housing Stock (p. 20)	Yes	No	
Develop a Systematic CIP to Upgrade Subdivisions to Current Standards (p. 20)	Yes	No	

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX

DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion

Part VII - Development Policies (p. 24)*	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
Priority Location for Mixed Use and High Intensity Development (p. 24)			
B-1 Mayfield Corridor Policies			
a. Promote Retail/Office Mixed Use Core Redevelopment at Intersection of Mayfield and Green Roads. (p. 25)	Yes	Underway	City Council is currently considering a new zoning classification for the Mayfield Green intersection. This classification has been recommended by the P.C.
• Permit high density mix of retail and offices	Yes	Underway	See above note
• Promote buildings up to 100 feet height with deck parking	Yes	Underway	The maximum permitted height being considered in the new Mayfield Green District is 65 feet. The regulations require that any additional height above 50 feet is only permitted when the location of the building is at least 300 feet from a residential zoning district.
• Allow apartments but with retail on the first floor	Yes	Underway	See note with "B-1-a" above
• Establish strong design review criteria to control "use relationship" and "street character".	Yes	Underway	See note with "B-1-a" above
• Conceal parking from the street	Yes	Underway	See note with "B-1-a" above

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX

DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion

Part VII - Development Policies (p. 24) *	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
b. Encourage Progressive Redevelopment of Areas Immediately Adjacent to the Core-After Core Area is Developed	Yes		
• Allow multi-story office buildings on the east and west side of green rd. North of Mayfield Rd. Core Area	Yes		
• Allow higher density residential (senior housing) north of Mayfield Rd. Core east and west of office uses to the east of city hall and west to Belvoir Boulevard	Yes		
• Allow retail/offices expansion/redevelopment into residential neighborhood (as needed)	Yes		
c. Permit Multi-Family, Retail and Offices Along Mayfield Rd. West of Belvoir Boulevard and Southeast of Mayfield and Warrentville Center Roads (p. 31) *	Yes	No	
• Allow expansion into existing residential areas	Yes	No	This could be revised to: "consider with restrictions, when requested." These restrictions are outlined in the implementation section.
• Promote commercial relocation to Mayfield/Green core area and encourage redevelopment of higher density residential	Yes	No	
B - 1 Green Road Policies			
d. Plan for Multi Story Offices along Green Rd, south of Mayfield Rd, between St. Gregory's Church and the Health Center. This policy is expanded to also potentially include the west side of	Yes	No	On the east side of Green Road this policy has been modified to only include the westerly portion of Ardendale. The east end of

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX

DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion

Part VII - Development Policies (p. 24) *	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
Green Road from the existing post office north to the Mayfield-Green mixed use area. (p. 32)*			Ardendale would be designated for residential development that could include infill clusters and for town homes.
e. Plan for Higher Density Residential Development East side of Green Rd between University Suburban Health Center and Greenview Upper Elementary School. The City should also consider rezoning the isolated R-75 area (on the east side of Green to the R-50 classification to facilitate this objective and to be consistent with the prevailing zoning in this area. (p.32)	Yes	No	
f. Promote development/redevelopment in the Monticello/Green industrial area that promotes uses which: (1) Promote uses that support the expanded residential development occurring in the northern portion of the City (i.e. housing, limited retail, physical fitness center, etc.); (2) Is compatible with the existing parks and bike trail being proposed in this location; (3) Is a "regional" facility seeking a non-residential location to serve the needs of South Euclid and other eastside communities; (4) Provide alternative locations for existing facilities in South Euclid that may require more land and/or their relocation would assist the City in achieving other compelling objectives. This policy recognizes that, based on the isolated nature of this relatively small industrial area, the limited demand for industrial development, and the changing location criteria (near major highways, and larger tracts) for industrial uses, Monticello/Green may no longer be a high priority location for industrial uses. This policy	New	Is being implemented	Area is the Subject of Preliminary Environmental Assessment – To fully implement this policy the City would need to amend the range of permitted uses and consider the merits of the current development standards.

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX

DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion

Part VII - Development Policies (p. 24) *	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
<p>further recognizes that there are limited locations suitable for major "regional" facilities on the near east side or suitable relocation sites for existing facilities in the City. (p. 32)</p>			
<p>B - 1 Cedar Road Corridor Policies</p>			
<p>g. Expand Retail along North Side of Cedar Rd East of Cedar Center (p. 32)*</p>	Yes	No	<p>This Plan addendum clarifies that the eastern boundary of the commercial/retail area on the north side of Cedar Road ends at Miramar. This is the same as the policy in the 2000 Plan. This policy is only reiterated here since some people have misread the boundary as graphically designated on Map 5. This policy continues to be consistent with the residential policy that has been established on the south side of Cedar Road in University Heights.</p>
<p>h. Expand Multi Family along Warrensville Center Rd and to the West of Cedar Center; Discourage Commercial Expansion along Warrensville Road Corridor (p. 32)</p>	Yes	No	
<p>i. Limit Office Retail Development to a Node at Cedar and Green Roads (p. 32)</p>	Yes	No	
<p>B-2 - Area 2. Priority Locations for Clustered, Attached and Senior</p>			

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

**PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX**

**DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion**

Part VII - Development Policies (p. 24) *	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
Housing (p. 32) *			
a. West of Warrensville Rd and North of Cedar Center (p. 32)	Yes	No	
b. Area between Warrensville Rd and Wrenford Road, North of Cedar to Harwood Road (p. 33)	Yes	No	
c. West of Princeton Boulevard in Northwest Section of the City (p. 34)	Yes	No	
B-3 Area 3. Priority Locations for Infill Housing at Density Permitted in Code			
a. Oakwood Country Club Site. Consistent with this policy consideration could be given to permitting development at R-50 densities. This would be consistent with the prevailing zoning along Warrensville Center Road. Currently the Oakwood site is zoned R-75. (p. 33)	Yes	No	This policy should be re-evaluated to determine if the zoning should be consistent with the existing (or anticipated) zoning on the Cleveland heights portion of Oakwood.
b. Backland on Northeast Section-Ammon/Trebisky Area (p. 33)	Yes	Partially implemented	Some development has occurred in this location consistent with this policy.
c. On Small Existing Vacant Sites (p. 33)	Yes	No	

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

**PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX**

**DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion**

Part VII - Development Policies (p. 24) *	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
City Wide Remedial Effort Policies			
1. Continue and Seek New Tools for Housing Maintenance (p. 33) *	Yes	No	Specific new tools to be considered include: Increasing the level of routine housing enforcement; Establishing point of sale inspections
2. Develop Systematic CIP to Meet Street Standards (p. 33)	Yes	Underway	The City has developed a systematic approach through its capital improvement budgeting to upgrade substandard streets throughout the City..

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX

DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion

Part VIII - Implementation Measures *	The Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
A. Zoning Text Amendments (p. 35)			
1. Create New C-3 Downtown Business District to be Applied at Mayfield Green Intersection (p. 35)	Yes	Underway	New District has been recommended by the Planning Commission and is now before Council
a. Permit building height of 100 feet	Yes	No	New district - allows max 65 ft height
b. Require deck parking if building exceeds four floors	Yes	No	Not being required in new district, deck expected but not required
c. Require buildings near street to create a "downtown" environment	Yes	No	New district requires buildings near the street
d. Prohibit residential dwelling units on ground floor but encourage on upper floors of new buildings	Yes	Underway	Included in New District being considered for adoption
New Modify the Zoning that applies to the Monticello/Green area to reflect both the range of uses and development standards desired.	New	Is being implemented	
2. Allow Retail and Multi Family as Conditional Uses in Residential Districts if: (p. 36) The City could also consider expanding the depth of the commercial zoning in those locations that are clearly not sufficient to accommodate economical use of the property – either for the existing buildings or redevelopment.			Code would need to be revised to permit the flexibility subject to these restrictions. However, There is no reason to implement this policy unless there is a specific request. This differs from the existing zoning which only permits parking to be considered in the adjacent residential areas.

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

**PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX**

**DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion**

Part VIII - Implementation Measures *	The Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
a. Proposed development is contiguous to and coordinated with development on the main commercial street	Yes	No	
b. No access is provided on the side street within the residential zone	Yes	No	
c. Proper buffering is provided between commercial/ multi-family or single family homes	Yes	No	
3. Conditionally Permit Independent Multi-Family Buildings in the C-1 and C-2 Districts (p. 36)*	Yes	No	Permitted densities need to be "sufficiently high" to encourage the use of this option.
4. Conditionally Permit Taller Buildings in the C-2 District when Buildings are Sufficiently Setback from Existing Residences (p. 36)	Yes	No	
5. Create a Residential Overlay Zone that would reduce setbacks to enable existing homes to: (p. 36)	Needs	No	Need to consider lifestyle choices and desires of potential home buyers
a. Be expanded with two-car garages	to be	No	
b. Be expanded as empty nester/senior housing	discussed	No	
* Reduce front setback to 25 or 30 feet		No	
* Eliminate side setback; allow zero lot line development		No	

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX

DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion

Part VIII - Implementation Measures *	The Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apply overlay district along Warrensville Center Rd corridor north of Cedar and in the ITA north of Mayfield Rd 		No	
6. Amend Current Planned Unit Residential Development Regulations to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduce minimum required project area from 5 acres to 2 acres b. Permit greater flexibility in the arrangement of units and lot sizes; yet keep density same as now permitted 	Yes	Yes	Zoning Code was amended Zoning Code was amended In a recent amendment to the PRD regulations the Planning Commission was granted the authority to reduce the permitted density of a proposed development, if necessary, to assure that any such new development is compatible with its surroundings. While continuing to be sensitive to the impacts of new developments on established neighborhoods, such flexibility should also permit the Planning Commission, with Council's confirmation, to increase the density of a project for the sole purpose of assuring its economic feasibility.
7. Allow Planning Commission to Relax Parking Requirements for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Older buildings b. Along public transit lines 	Yes	No	
	Yes	No	
	Yes	No	

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan

**PART II
SUMMARY MATRIX**

**DRAFT
For Planning Commission Review and Discussion**

Part VIII - Implementation Measures *	The Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
c. When nearby parking lots may be available and adjacent uses do not generate same peak periods	Yes	No	
B. Administrative And Financial Assistance (p. 39)*			
1. Provide Community Development Support at City Hall to: (p. 39)	Yes	Yes	Hired Economic Development Manager
a. Promote plan's policies within the city and potential investors	Yes	Ongoing	
b. Help potential investors in understanding the types of projects desired by the city	Yes	Ongoing	
c. Help applicants/investors understand & expedite the review process	Yes	Ongoing	
d. Seek both outside and creative ways of financing new development- as incentives	Yes	Ongoing	
2. Prepare and Submit "Demonstration Grants" on the Premise That the Investment Needs of South Euclid are Not Unique (p. 40)	Yes	Underway	Preliminary Environmental Assessment to be conducted for the Monticello/Green area for the purposes of pursuing grants for clean-up/ acquisition/ redevelopment
3. Review Existing Regulations/Procedures to Determine if Additional Programs are Warranted to Achieve Highest Possible Level of Maintenance. As part of this review the City should Continue to Pursue the Adoption of the Point of Sale Inspection Program	Yes	Ongoing	

* Outline and page numbers are those in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan